

A SHORT
VINDICATION
OF THE
ASSOCIAT SYNOD,
FROM THE

CHARGE of SCHISM, PERJURY, &c.

Led against them

In a late PAMPHLET, intituled, THE TRUE
STATE of the QUESTION, upon which a
BREACH followed in the ASSOCIAT SYNOD,
at EDINBURGH, Thursday April 9. 1747.

By some Seceders in and about Glasgow.

GLASGOW:

Printed for, and sold by TOBIAS LUNDIN, Staymaker,
and JOHN JAMISON, Wright, both in Mary's Close
Gallowgate.

M DCC XLVII.

RB.23 a-6895

NOT A DIGIT

N. B. *As we do not set up for Authors, but
merely to contribute our Mite for vindicating
the Truth, and the Associate Synod, in ad-
dressing thereto, we hope to be excused for
borrowing the most of what follows, from a
Copy of Part of their Acts and Proceedings
transmitted to us for our Information, by a
private, Wellwisher to the Cause, who had
found Ways and Means of getting at the
same.*



VINDICATION &c.

AS the Acts and Proceedings of the Associate Synod, at *Edinburgh*, in April 1747 (those we reckon the Synod who are far against a present Swearing the religious Clause of some Burgeses Oaths, they having been a Majority exclusive of Parties) are in the Press, and will be Published with all possible Expedition; a descending particularly into the State of the Difference, betwixt them and the few who sustained themselves the Synod, and voted the following Overture. *viz.*

“ Whether the Decision anent the religious Clause in some Burgeses-Oaths, passed by this Synod, April 1746, shall now or afterward, be made a Term of Ministerial and Christian Communion, ay and untill the making of the same to be so, shall be referred by way of Overture unto Presbyterys and Kirk Sessions, in order to their giving their Judgement thereanent, that so there may in the mean Time be a friendly Dealing among the Members of this Synod, with one another, in a way of Conference and Prayer, in order to their comming thro’ the Lord’s Pity, to see Eye to Eye, in the Matter of the said religious Clause, or Not?” In Opposition to this other Question, *viz.* “ Proceed to call for the Reasons of Protest and the Answers thereto, for having them read and considered, or Not?” seems very Superfluous; Only in regard the said Pamphlet, hath in the mean Time, no small Tendency to beget Prejudices in the Minds of some single tho’ well meaning Readers, against the very Revd. the Associate Synod, as Schismaticks, Covenant-Breakers, and what not, without waiting upon a fair hearing of what they have to say for themselves. It cannot justly offend, that we anticipate a litle (and it is but a very litle) of what the Synod will soon make appear in its own Light, without staying on what Observations might be made on the Title of what is called the true State of the Question,

The Revd. Author thereof avers, page 3d. “ That the religious Clause of the Burgeses Oath, was condemned as sinfull, in a thin Meeting at *Edinburgh* April 1746.” But it will appear in due Time, That as that Meeting was before agreed on by both sides, so there were present therein about two thirds of the then Con-

stitute

stituent Members of Synod; that the rest were absent at that Time was wholly owing to themselves; Nor have the five Protesters on that side been able to make above two more positively for the Lawfulness of that Oath besides two Brethren, who were not then ordained and about Twelve Elders most of whom are Burgeses, and consequently are by Law reckoned Parties in the Affair.

Our Author adds, "That that Meeting ordained all who had sworn that Clause to renounce it," &c. But whether this be the plain Truth, will best appear from the Words of the Act, whence this Inference is drawn, namely, "The Synod find, that Burgeses of the Secession, who are already concerned in any such Oaths, should be required in order to their Admission into the Bond for renewing, our Solem Covenants, to attend Conference with their respective Sessions, for signifying a Satisfaction with the present Judgement of the Synod, a Sense of the Mistake they have hitherto, thro' Inadvertency been under concerning such Burgeses Oaths." Now, this being all that's said concerning it in the Synod's Sentence, they must be more than ordinary sharp-sighted, who find any Appointment hereto to renounce that Oath, or even a Warrant for Prosecuting Reculants on that Head.

The Revd. Author gives as a Reason, p. 4. why the first Overture was put to a Vote, namely, that it was promised by the Moderator of the Meeting at Stirling in September 1746, that it should be first Voted; But besides that we have heard it denied, that ever there was such a Promise given by Authority of the Court: Those who were against that Overture, both agreed and protested against it, "Because it was irregularly thrust in upon the Synod at first, and has been all along irregularly pushed unto the turning them aside from their proper Business and Duty; And because the Question proceeds upon a Resolution suppressing proper Light about the Subject of the Question to be had from a Consideration of the Reasons of Dissent from the Sentence, in April 1746, and Answers thereto by the Synod: And because the Question is laid and calculate, for imposing upon and perverting the Judgement of Members, seeing the manifest Scope thereof is to set the Names and Pleasure of Men in the Room of Truth and Duty upon this Affair; And because this

Question,

“ Question, is for introducing a sinfull and dangerous In-
 “ novation, of subjecting the lawfull Decision of Synod,
 “ upon a Controversy of Faith and Case of Conscience, un-
 “ to the Consultation of inferior Judicatories, particularly
 “ Cirk Sessions: And because an Affirmative upon this
 “ Question must run upon a Tolleration Scheme, in direct
 “ Opposition to the Lord's word and Presbyterian Princi-
 “ ples; by judicially allowing of, at least for a Time,
 “ the Swearing contradictory Oaths; Our homologating
 “ the publick Defections and Corruptions of the Day;
 “ which we testify against; and the other condemning all
 “ these, as Grounds of the Lords Controversy to be testi-
 “ fied against,” &c.

Our Author goes on, p. 5. in telling that “Rolls being
 “ called and Votes marked, it carried by 20 Votes, That the
 “ Decision at *Edinburgh*, April 1747. should not be a
 “ Term of Ministerial or Christian Communion,” &c
 According, to the Overture before quoted, he hath sadly
 bemisted his Reader, for before ever that Overture came
 to a Vote, Mr. *Moncrief* Protested, “ that the said Meet-
 “ ing, was not, nor ought to be held and reputed a due
 “ and lawfully constitute Meeting of the Associate Synod
 “ IN THIS STEP: Because, they are proceeding upon
 “ a Resolution, which suppresses proper Light upon the
 “ Subject of the Question, while many Members were
 “ never present at any judicial Examination thereof, and
 “ some have been complaining, that they are precluded
 “ from necessary Acquaintance therewith; And because,
 “ notwithstanding of much insisting to the contrary, the
 “ Members protesting against the Sentence of Synod, in
 “ April 1746, who are necessarily and directly Parties upon
 “ the Question, are sustaining themselves Judges for vote-
 “ ing in it:” In which Protest Thirteen Ministers and
 Ten Elders, agreed, and therefore did not vote at all; Be-
 side, about Eight other Ministers and some Elders, did al-
 so protest against that first Question being put to a Vote,
 or caused mark in the Minutes their Desire of a Delay;
 So, that the Vote came out but of Nine Ministers in whole,
viz Mr. *Ebenezer Erskine* Mr. *Ralph Erskine*, Mr. *Fish-*
er, Mr. *Horn*, Mr. *McCara*, Mr. *Henry Erskine*, Mr.
Black, Mr. *Andrew Thomson*, and Mr. *Telfer*, and eleven
 Elders, almost wholly Burgresses. Her-

Hereupon Mr. *Thomas Mair* as Moderator of the last Meeting of Synod, and who opened up this Meeting, and whose Turn it was by the constant Practice of Church Jurisdictions, to Officiate as Moderator, either in case the present Moderator were absent, or refused to act, consistently as was the case here, did (without any Concert, previous to that very Day, as the whole Members declared in their first Meeting thereafter) read the following, Declaration and Protestation, viz " Whereas this Meeting of
 " Synod have now passed a Vote, and made a Resolution
 " upon the Affirmative of that Question, which has been
 " insisted upon in opposition to a proceeding unto the
 " Reasons of Protest against the Sentence of Synod, in Ap.
 " 1746. with the Answers to said Reasons; and consider-
 " ing the two Protestations which have been entred this
 " Day concerning that Affair; And considering that by
 " the foresaid Step, this Meeting of Synod have *materially*
 " dropt the whole Testimony among their Hands, allow-
 " ing of, at least for a Time, a material Abjuration there-
 " of. And considering that beside a considerable Number
 " of Elders, the Majority of Ministers in this Meeting,
 " who are the proper Judges in a Controversy of Faith
 " and Case of Conscience, and who could be Judges in the
 " present Controversy, have been all along, at this Meet-
 " ing contending for the proper Business and Duty of the
 " Synod, in opposition to the contrary Torrent: There-
 " fore he declared and protested, that the lawfull Authority
 " and Power of the Associate Synod is devolved upon, and
 " most in a constitute Meeting of the foresaid Members,
 " Ministers and Elders, together with any other Mem-
 " bers who shall cleave unto them in a Way of confess-
 " ing what sinfull Steps and Compliances they have fallen
 " into upon this Occasion. As likewise he declared and
 " protested, that the foresaid Members, ought, in Duty,
 " to the Lord and his Heritage, to take up, and exercise
 " the Authority and Power of the Associate Synod, law-
 " fully and fully devolved upon them as above; and for
 " this End to meet to Morrow at Ten of the Clock, For-
 " noon in Mr. *Gib's* House that they may regularly en-
 " ter upon, and proceed in the Business of the Synod."
 To this there was no Return made by the voting Mem-
 bers

bers: Wherefore Mr. *Mair*, and Thirteen other Ministers, with Eleven Elders removed, as did Mr. *James Mair* the present Moderator, Mr. *Smyton* and Mr. *Paton* went home without joyning either Side, tho' One, if not both of them, have since declared for the Meeting, in Mr. *Gib's*: And Mr. *Clelland*, who was absent on that Occasion, came in the second Week of the Synod and joined the last mentioned Meeting; So that here was no Separation but a local removing from one Place to another; in both which the Synod, when altogether, had frequently Sitten. That the Synod intended no Separation is evident, amongst other Circumstances, from these following, viz Mr. *Moncrief's* Protest, to which so many, adhered, as hath been noticed, which protests against their Constitution only IN THIS STEP: And, 2ly From Mr. *Mair's* Declaration and Protestation, which the Synod homologate in their very first Meeting thereafter, which "declares the lawfull Power
 " of the Synod to ly in a constitute Meeting of the fore-
 " said Members, together with any other Members who
 " shall cleave unto them, in a way of confessing, what
 " sinful Steps and Compliances they have fallen into up-
 " on this Occasion:" And accordingly Mr. *Matthews* was One who, tho' he had never before taken part with the honest Side, but on the contrary was partly led off by the other, was yet (without the Intervention of humane Help as he afterwards owned) constrained to join Issue with his Brethren in Mr. *Gib's*, and was received by the Synod: As Mr. *John Erskine* (who likewise was carried away by the Dissimulation of some, but hath since, of his own accord acknowledged his Mistake to his Congregation) was also by his Presbytery, and so might the others if they had inclined. Now if, as *Rutherford* says, *Due Right*, &c. p. 255. "When the greatest part of a Church maketh De-
 " fection from the Truth, the lesser Part remaining sound,
 " the greatest Part is the Church of Separatists: Though
 " the manifest and greatest part in the actual Exercise of
 " Discipline be the Church; yet in the case of right Dis-
 " cipline, the best tho' fewest, is the Church;" how much more Warantably may it be said, that those who are for the Sentence in Ap. 1746, (being both the greatest part, and cleaving tenaciously to the Cause and Testimony of
 the

the Day laid down in the *Act and Testimony of the Associate Presbytery*, and other Testimonies since amitted by them) are the only lawfull and right Constitute Associate Synod?

Our Author's Supposition p. 6. that if his Question had carried in the Affirmative the Synod had accounted that Meeting exceeding lawfull, tho' very injurious is not in the least disproved by their concern in electing the Moderator and Clark; for there was other Business to come in before them, they did not concur in that Election allenarly, with a View to this Affair, nor was it the only Thing under Consideration while together at that Meeting; Besides their only Quarrel with the Lawfulness of the Constitution of the Synod, respected *THUS STEP*, and thus they testified before the Vote, as we have already shown.

After a short, and as is already evidenced to be a very obscure and partial State of the Difference, our Author gives what were, in his View, the Reasons of what he calls the Synod's Sentence, tho' not the Deed of near one half of the Members present: But as these Reasons are materially the same with those he gave in to the Synod against the Sentence in April 1746, where to very sufficient Answers are already made by the Synod, and are now at the Press, and as any suitable Answer to the Reasons laid down in that Pamphlet would necessarily oblige to an extending this at more Length, than will consist with our Conveniency; And as what is Presently expedient to be noticed thereanent may be taken upon in what follows, we forbear any Particular Return thereunto; and instead thereof shall venture to sum up a few Reasons assigned by the Synod against the first Overture before quoted; As,

1. The Synod could not, according to any due and lawfull Order, proceed unto any new Decision about the Sentence in April 1746, especially in prejudice thereunto, without first calling for, and considering the foresaid Reasons and Answers; Because otherwise it could not regularly appear whether the Sentence deserved Alteration or Amendment and whether the Opposition made unto it, with the Reflections cast upon it by the Protesters, against it in the foresaid Question were reasonable or not.

2. It is especially incumbent upon a Court of Christ

to search for, and much more to admit of all proper and necessary Light upon the Subject of a Question to be determined: But by going into the first Question, the Synod did refuse, suppress, and exclude proper and necessary Light upon the Subject about which they were going to decide. And thus manifest Injury was done to Truth, by refusing to let it have a fair hearing, and by laying a Foundation for having it condemned in the Dark, without the Benefit of its own Light, for preventing such Condemnation. Moreover thus Rejecting of the means of Light was contrary to Scripture Precepts of judging righteous Judgement, searching after Knowledge, and walking in the Light, contrary to a Dependence upon Scripture Promises of Light and Leading: As also contrary to the Example of Scripture, Prayer for the Lord's sending forth his Light and Truth; more particularly, by the above Procedure, the Opposers of the Synod's Sentence fore said, were refusing to come to the Light that their Deeds might be made manifest.

3. The fore said Vote was a material reversing of the Sentence in *April 1746*, in regard, while it finds the present Swearing by Seceders of the Religious Clause of some Burgeses Oaths sinful and inconsistent with the Bond for renewing our Covenants; and ordains seceding Burgeses to attend Conference with their respective Sessions, for signifying a satisfaction with the present Judgement of the Synod, &c. Yet the Sentence this Year is manifestly laid in immediate Opposition, at least for a Time, unto the alledging of any Disagreement or Inconsistency betwixt a Burgeses Oath in its religious Clause, and the Oath of the Bond for renewing our Covenants, so as Persons engaged in such Burgeses Oaths should be taken no Account of on that Head: Accordingly the Resolution fore said is manifestly laid for eximing all Persons, at least for a Time, from being called to any Account, or any way quarrelled for any Opposition or walking contrary to the Sentence which Materially reverses the same.

4. The State to which these Brethren who are for the Oath have brought Matters, is very astonishing: They would not allow, it to be put fairly and openly to a Vote, Reverse the Sentence of the Synod in *April 1746*; or not,

because they saw they would have lost part of their Number hereby, but did it under a Mask, as already noticed, Now as the Sentence in April 1746, are both standing in the Minutes, and as the One abjures what the other Avouches, the first finding that the Swearing the Religious Clause of some Burgess Oaths is inconsistent with, and contradictory to a Swearing the Bond for renewing our Covenants; and the other, upon the Matter, determining that, at least for some Time, the conjunct Swearing of these contradictory Oaths ought not to be opposed or quarrelled: This was indeed a dreadful Affair, and no less surprising than for a Fountain to send forth sweat Waters and bitter both at the same Time.

5. The Reference made of the Affair by the foresaid Resolution unto inferior Judicatories, particularly Kirk-Sessions, as it was never moved before the Sentence in April 1746; so it seems to be a step inconsistent with the Practice of the Synod at *Jerusalem*, who, as is Recorded, *Acts* fifteen cognosed and determined the Matter that was brought before them without making any such Reference and is subversive of our *Confession of Faith*, Chap. 3 1. Sect. 3. "It belongeth to Synod's and Councils Ministerially to determine Controversies of Faith and Cases of Conscience;" and of Presbyterian Order in the House of God, which is to regulate the Inferior by the Superior Courts, and to reserve to every Court the Cognizance of that only which is proper and competent to them.

6. The above Vote was carried in a Way most unfair and unreasonably, which was calculate for imposing upon, and perverting the Judgement of Members and others in the Case: For, (1) Tho' this Vote reverses the Sentence in April 1746, materially, yet they would by no Means allow it to be expressly brought into Question, but kept in the Dark for making sure their Party. (2) These Voters made a great Out-cry about Depositions and Excommunications, as if the Synod could hardly been got restrained from doing so with their Brethren, while Nevertheless there was no real Occasion for that Noise; but on the contrary the Synod declared themselves for all the practical Forbearances toward their Brethren in the Matter that could consist with the common Rules of Religion: However

However the Noise about restraining from Depositions and Excommunications went still on, and a Point of real Injury to Truth was dressed up as only a Point of Tenderness and due Regard to Fathers and Brethren. (3.) The said Resolution or Vote was laid under a Pretence of necessary Regard to Barrier Acts, *Annis* 1639. and 1641, about consulting Presbyteries and Kirk-Sessions, while yet the Answers to the Reasons of Dissent shew that these Acts concern Novations in Discipline and Church Government, which the present Case does not, and that a Synod being composed of all the Ministers in the Bounds, and a Ruling Elder from every Session, there is no such Reason for a reference from them as from the General Assembly, which is a delegated Court composed not of above a fifth part of the Constituent Members. (4.) Seven Ministers and one Elder who were Protesters against the Sentence, and who could have no real Title to Vote in the Question were, as was observed, violently Sustaining themselves Judges for Voting in it over the Belly of great Opposition. (5.) The Majority of Ministers present, who are the proper *Judges* in a Controversy of Faith and Case of Conscience, and who were not Parties in the Matter, together with a good Number of Elders, were under Protestation thereagainst and others had as we also noticed, caused mark their Desire of a Delay, And. (6.) The Vote came out but of Nine Ministers and Eleven Elders, for the Resolution who made up few more than a third part of the Members present, of whom thirteen Ministers and Ten Elders were under Protestation, against putting the Vote. Likewise of the said Voters, Six Ministers and one Elder were Parties, who had no Right to Vote; and of the other three Ministers, one had never been in Synod before, and another had never been present at any judicial Examination of the Subject in Question, as was the Case also with the Elders.

Thus was the Matter carried by a Multiplicity of sad Disorders, and by such Procedure the prevailing Party, did openly contradict the Duty, prevent the Business, overturn the whole Order, and unhinge the Constitution of Court.

The Revd. Author of the said Pamphlet, concludes; with putting some Questions arising from the whole to his Readers: And altho' we are convinced of our insufficiency for answering these to due Purpose, yet we hope to be excused for presuming to conclude also, with what we do with Submission, conceive a sufficient Answer thereto in the mean Time: And,

Quest. I. *Have they not separate from us, because we voted to hold Communion with them?*

Ans. The Associate Synod have not positively separated from their Brethren who are for the lawfulness of the Burgeiss-Oath; But have only withdrawn from them *in this Step*; and that not for their voting to hold Communion with them, but for their suppressing proper Light in the Question, allowing a Swearing contradictory Oaths, and for their Reasons formerly hinted at.

Q. 2. *Is not this unreasonable Separation a Breach of the Oath of the Covenant?*

Ans. We conceive not: (1.) Because the alledged Separation is denied. This same Author admits p. 4. That Mr. Moncrief, and Mr. Thomas Mair were for shifting a Vote about making this Matter a Term of Communion; and, p. 14. he also grants that most of the Brethren on the opposite side frequently declared, that they did not intend making it a Term of Communion. If this Author and his Brethren have, by their pushing said Vote, and behaving as above, brought the Matter to be a Term of Communion now, they have themselves to blame: For it will not be denied that on the very Day they Separate the Brethren against the Oath moved, that it might first be agreed on, whether the Swearing of that Oath be a Matter of Sin or Duty. And, (2.) The Oath of the Covenant binds them only to Unity with their Brethren in the Truth: But from what is above, and will much better appear from the Proceedings of Synod, the Union sought for their by these Brethren is such as contradicts Scripture, our subordinate Standards, and the Act and Testimony, and would involve them in Defection from attained to Reformation: Yea, by the same Argument the Plea of the established Church, against the whole Ministers who seceded from them, will hold good, namely, that they by Separating from the establish-

stablished Church have violated their Ordination Vows, by breaking that Unity which they swore to maintain, while yet all our seceding Ministers explained it of Union with the Centre and of Peace cemented with Truth.

Q. 3. While they refuse to suffer their Decision to come under Examination of Presbyteries and Sessions; does not this savour of implicite Faith, and is it not contrary to Barrier Acts 1639, 1641, and to Confession of Faith, Chap. 31. Sect. 4.

Ans. As there was no Reference made about renewing our Covenants though plainly in a Matter of far greater Importance than the present; So there was never one Word of Referring the present Question either, till after the Sentence in *April 1746*, when it was thought a very popular Topick, and great Noise hath been made about it since that Time: When this Revd. Author shall shew a Warrant or Precedent for referring from a Synod to Presbyteries, and Kirk-Sessions in a Matter of Faith and Case of Conscience after a Synod have judicially determined therein, it will then be Time enough to give a further Answer to this Question. What he adduces the Confession for is no ways Satisfying; for as Synods and Councils may Err, much more may Sessions and Presbyteries: Yea, the Vindicators of the Burgess Oath also, seeing their doing so hath remarkably led them into a vindicating that very Settlement in the Established Church which, together with their Brethren, they formerly testified against.

Q. 4. Is not their way a material Suspencion or Deposition of all their Brethren, Ministers and Elders?

Ans. We leave to the Reverend Synod to show what is their Way towards their Brethren on the side of the Oath. But if, as we are informed, the Synod be able to make appear, that their Brethren are chargeable with suppressing and refusing Light, giving Allowance to swear contradictory Oaths, departing from the Testimony against the Evils and Defects in the Revolution and Union Settlements, perverting the Power which the Lord Jesus hath given them, and introducing Anarchy and confusion into the Church, it will be a wonder (tho' we do not wish to see Occasion for it) if the Synod do not only materially, but
formally

formally, and expressly suspend or Depose their thus offending Brethren.

Q. 5. How will they prove, as they affirm, that the above Decision April 1747 is a dropping or abjuring of the Testimony.

Ans. The Associate Synod have no where, that we know of, affirmed, that their Brethren have objured the Testimony. But if the Bond of the Covenant, and the Burges's Oath, be two opposite and contradictory to one another: If the Profession of Religion which is made by the established Church, and is Authorised by the Laws of this Realm in the Revolution and Union Settlements, is the Profession of Religion Sworn unto in the said Oath: And if this Profession and Settlement is a different Profession of Religion from that Profession which is made by those who adopt the present Testimony for Religion and Reformation, and who come under the Bond for renewing our Solemn Covenants: more particularly if the Profession Sworn unto in the Burges's Oath be a Profession which takes up only with a Part of the Testimony of the Day, under the Name of the whole, If it overlooks the Reformation attained betwixt the 1638 and 1649, if it omits avouching the alone Headship of our Lord Jesus Christ in and over his Church, the intrinsick: Power of the Church, the Divine Right of Presbytery and the inviolable Obligation of our Covenants; and if that Profession involves us in giving our Consent to the Establishment of Episcopacy in *England*, all which every Minister in the Secession have Sworn, then, How can we possibly reckon otherwise, But that the allowing Seceding Burges's, in the mean Time to Swear these contradictory Oaths is allowing them materially to perjure themselves, and objure the Testimony thus Sworn to against the Profession and Settlement in the established Church?

Q. 6. How such a way of Doing will stand the Trial of the Word of God, the Tribunal of God, or yet of the impartial World?

Ans. The Word of God forbids the taking the Lord's Name in vain, a Swearing false, contradictory Oaths, a quitting and not holding fast the Testimony attained to, &c. And therefore condemning a present Swearing the religious Clause

Clause of some Burgeſſes Oaths, being culpable in all the above mentioned, and other Reſpects as is partly made appear in a Pamphlet already publiſhed, and will further Appear from the Synods Proceeding, is a Step which we have not the leaſt doubt of ſtanding the Trial of the Lord's Word: But as the Men of the World, except a very few are willingly ignorant of the State of the Teſtimony, and acting inconfiſtent therewith, we can no more ſubmit this Affair to their Verdict, than we can ſubmit the judging of Colours to a blind Man.

Q. 7. *Whether thoſe who join them in this Way, do not partake with them in Breach of Covenant?*

Ans. As the Miniſters who have condemned a preſent Swearing the religious Clause of ſome Burgeſſes Oaths, are in ſo doing acting a Part moſt conſiſtent with, and indiſpenſably bound on them, by the Covenants, and have in nothing that we know of receded from the Teſtemony eſpouſed; but all (human Frailties excepted) endeavouring faithfully to fulfil their Miniſtry, we are ſure our not joining with them as the Lord gives Acceſs in Providence, would be ſo far from freeing us of partaking with them in Breach of Covenant; that it would be a ruſhing on certain Perjury.

To conclude, it is no leſs grieving than aſtoniſhing, to ſee Our Author who has Sworn to ſtrengthen his Brethrens Hands, and endeavour to preſerve Unity betwixt them and their Congregations, durſt barefacedly kything a fondneſs for renting them aſunder. But however active He and ſome others are to effectuate and bring about this, by ſpreading their calumnious Miſſives thro' different Corners of the Land, yet as no Weapon formed againſt Zion (however gilded and patronized by old Fathers) ſhall proſper ſo we deſire to acknowledge to the Lord's Praise, that Providence that hath hitherto been exerciſed in keeping his faithfull Miniſters and People, from the ſiniſtineſs of ſaid Oath, ſo united as they are, and concerning them we Truſt it will daily appear more evident, that *The Righteous ſhall hold on his Way, and that they who have clean Hands ſhall, wax ſtronger and ſtronger.*

G L A S G O W, May 7

18th 1747.

F I N I S.



